

**-- REMARKS --**

**Drawings.** In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Bennett objected to the drawings for failing to show an automotive head lamp as recited in claim 10 as originally filed. To overcome the objection, the Applicant submits a new drawing sheet 1/1 illustrating a FIG. 4 showing each feature of claim 10 as originally filed. Withdrawal of the objection of the drawings is therefore respectfully requested.

**Specification.** The Applicant has amended the specification herein to incorporate a new FIG. 4 added to overcome an objection to the drawings. No new matter was introduced by the amendment of the specification herein.

**Claims.** In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Bennett rejected pending claims 1-11 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.112:

- A. Examiner Bennett rejected claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,796,869 to *Stone*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Bennett's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11 over *Stone*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Stone*. To warrant this anticipation rejection of claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11, *Stone* must show each and every limitation of independent claim 1 in as complete detail as in contained in independent claim 1. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully asserts that *Stone* fails to show "characterized in that the after-glowing material is shaped in a predetermined pattern for displaying information" in as complete detail as in contained in independent claim 1 and supported by FIGS. 1-4 of the present application.

Specifically, as shown in FIG. 1, *Stone* discloses a band 44 and a sleeve 92 that are coated with after-glowing material where the after-glowing material has the shape of band 44 and sleeve 92, and not the shape of the information printed on band 44 and sleeve 92. See, *Stone* at column 2, lines 36-55; and column 4, lines 21-35.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Stone* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 6-9 and 11 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2, 3, 6-9 and 11 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2, 3, 6-9 and 11 are allowable over *Stone* for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Stone*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2, 3, 6-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Stone* is therefore respectfully requested.

- B.** Examiner Bennett rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,796,869 to *Stone* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0127279 to *Cok*

Claims 4 and 5 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 4 and 5 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 4 and 5 are allowable over *Stone* in view of *Cok* for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Stone*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stone* in view of *Cok* is respectfully requested.

- C. Examiner Bennett rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,430,232 to *Stone* in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,430,232 to *Lynch*

Claim 10 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 10 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 10 is allowable over *Stone* in view of *Lynch* for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Stone*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stone* in view of *Lynch* is respectfully requested.

**SUMMARY**

Examiner Bennett's rejections of claims 1-11 have been obviated by remarks herein supporting an allowance of independent claim 1 over *Stone*. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-11 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Bennett is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **October 30, 2006**

Respectfully submitted,  
RALPH HUBERT PETERS

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
& STANDARDS  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

---

Frank Keegan  
Registration No. 50,145  
Attorney for Applicant

/FRANK C. NICHOLAS/

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

---

Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicant